

### **REMARKS**

Claims 9-22 are in the instant application. Applicant, by this Amendment, amends claims 9-14, 17, 18, and 22 to more positively recite Applicant's patentably novel connector, and adds new claim 23 to present the connector in varying scope.

The Office Action states that claims 17 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to claims 17 and 20; however, to reduce the issues, claim 17 is amended to include all of the limitations of claims 9 and 15, on which claim 17 was previously dependent. Claim 23, added by this Amendment, is dependent on amended claim 17. Support for claim 23 is found, among other places, in pre-amended claim 10.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests admittance of the amendment to claim 17 and of new claim 23; consideration of claims 17 and 23; withdrawal of the objection to claim 17; and allowance of claims 17 and 23.

Claim 20 has not been amended and is dependent on amended claim 18, which is dependent on amended claim 10, which is dependent on amended claim 9. In view of the amendments to claims 9, 10, and 18 discussed below and/or the limitations recited in claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 remains patentably novel.

Claims 9-15, 18, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 136872 to Masao (hereinafter also referred to as "Masao"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9-15, 18, 21 and 22; however, to eliminate this issue, claim 9, on which claims 10-15, 18, 21, and 22 are dependent, is amended, and claims 10-14, 17, 18, and 22 are amended to more positively recite Applicant's patentably novel connector. Support for the amendments to claims 9-14, 17, 18, and 22 is found, among other places, in the originally-filed claims and the drawings. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests admittance of the amendments to claims 9-14, 17, 18, and 22, and consideration of claims 9-15, 18, 21, and 22.

Amended claim 9 recites, among other things, a connector having contact members having elastically deformable points of contact formed in two locations. The contact members have a first leg, a second leg, and an intermediate leg interconnecting an end of the first leg to an end of the second leg, such that the contact members, when viewed

lying in a plane, have an S-shape, with one of the locations on the first leg and the other one of the locations on the second leg. The points of contact face away from one another in opposite directions.

The connector of Masao, when viewed lying in a plane, has a U-shaped leg at one end of the connector and a U-shaped leg at the other end of the connector. A leg of each of the U-shaped legs has points of contact that face in the same direction. Applicant's claimed connector, on the other hand, has points of contact that face away from one another in opposite directions.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-15, 18, 21, and 22.

Claims 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 16 and 19 and requests reconsideration thereof.

Claims 16 and 19 are indirectly dependent on claim 9. Claim 9 and Masao were discussed above.

In the above discussion of Masao, Applicant showed that the features of the connector disclosed by Masao do not anticipate claim 9, on which claims 16 and 19 are dependent. Applicant respectfully submits that even if the allegation of the Office Action regarding the staggering of the points of contact is correct, the patentably novel connector recited in Applicant's claims 9, 16, and 19 would not be disclosed because there is no disclosure in Masao of Applicant's claimed connector having, among other things, points of contact that face away from one another in opposite directions.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16 and 19, and requests allowance of claims 9-16, 18, 19, 21, and 22.

Application No. No. 10/526,202  
Paper Dated May 5, 2006  
Reply to USPTO Correspondence dated February 7, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 388-050627

This Amendment is deemed to place the application in condition for allowance. In the event issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned before further action is taken on the case.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

Donald C. Lepiane  
Registration No. 25,996  
Attorney for Applicant  
700 Koppers Building  
436 Seventh Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818  
Telephone: (412) 471-8815  
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094  
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com